

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-9 and 20-61 are cancelled. Claims 10-19 remain in this application and are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,500) in view of Kanno (U.S. Patent No. 6,602,567). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claim 10, for example, calls for a picture display device which includes:

video process means for combining the inputted plurality of video signals into a combined video signal for display on one screen according to associated picture size information for each of the plurality of video signals, the picture size information associated with a given one of the plurality of video signals being based on the received synchronous frequency information associated with that video signal[.] (Emphasis added.)

As acknowledged by the Examiner, "Daniels fails to teach the picture size information associated with a given one of the plurality of video signals being based on the received synchronous frequency information associated with that video signal."

The Examiner, however, contends that Kanno teaches the claimed feature. The Examiner cites sections of Kanno which describe examples of data communication between a CPU of a computer and a monitor control CPU of a display monitor. In one cited example, the computer requests that the monitor control CPU read current adjustment data for the monitor screen, and the monitor control CPU of the display monitor sends the adjustment data to the computer. (See Fig.2 and col.4 ll.2-8.) In another

cited example, the computer sends a "CHANGE SCREEN SIZE" adjustment item and a corresponding adjustment amount to the monitor control CPU of the monitor, and the monitor circuit of the monitor changes the screen size accordingly. (See Fig.3 and col.4 ll.28-31 and 37-38.) In yet another cited example, the computer inquires about the horizontal and vertical synchronous signal frequencies inputted to the display monitor, and the monitor control CPU extracts these frequencies and sends them back to the computer so that "the horizontal and vertical frequencies of synchronous signals in operation can be recognized." (See Fig.7 and col.5 ll.50-58.)

Hence, the cited sections of Kanno merely describe (i) an example where the computer commands the monitor to change screen size by a predefined adjustment amount and (ii) an example where the computer obtains the frequencies of the horizontal and vertical synchronous signal from the display monitor. There is no disclosure or suggestion in the cited sections of Kanno that the display monitor changes the screen size based on the horizontal and vertical synchronous signal frequencies, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the cited sections of Kanno that the computer determines the adjustment amount based on the horizontal and vertical synchronous signal frequencies that it receives from the monitor, and in fact, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the cited sections of Kanno as to how the amount of change in the screen size is determined. Clearly, the cited sections of Kanno do not disclose or suggest that the picture size information associated with a given video signal is based on the received synchronous frequency information associated with that video signal.

It follows that the cited sections of Daniels and Kanno, whether taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the picture display device defined in claim 10, and

claim 10 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10 and, for at least the same reasons, are also distinguishable over the cited art.

Independent claim 19 defines a method having steps similar to the functions recited in claim 10. Claim 19 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references for at least the same reasons.


Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant